

Appl. No. 10/720,512
Response to OA and RCE
Reply to OA of January 13, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 1999B060/3

REMARKS

New Claim

New claim 51 has been added to depend from claim 14. Support for new claim 51 is found, *inter alia*, in originally filed claim 14 and originally filed 15.

Claims Rejections

35 USC § 112

(a) The Examiner has rejected claim 14 because “the scope of ‘MFR’ cannot be determined” This has been corrected by insertion of the correct ASTM testing method and test conditions as disclosed in the specification on page 46, lines 27-28. Applicants have also amended the claim to specify that the recited melt index is measures at 190°C. This amendment is supported in the specification at, *inter alia*, page 13, lines 6-7. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

(b) The Examiner has again objected to the use of the phrase “propylene sequences” because the limitation “has no meaning.” Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner’s example focuses on a situation in which every propylene sequence is a diad. However, the claim does not limit the propylene sequences to diads. Thus, while if every propylene sequence were a diad, the Examiner’s reasoning would stand, when other propylene sequences are present (*e.g.*, triads, tetrads, etc.) it becomes apparent that the propylene sequence limitation does indeed have meaning. For example, the propylene sequences could be combinations of diads, triads, tetrads, and others, some of which are isotactic or syndiotactic and some of which are not. Therefore, the limitation does have meaning, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

35 USC § 102(b)

The Examiner asserts that because “any melt flow rate test conditions may be used” that “some combination of load and temperature will inherently result in a melt flow rate of greater than 250 dg/min.” As discussed above, Applicants have now specified the test conditions for determining MFR. The *Nakagawa* reference does not disclose polymers having a melt index as recited in the claims as amended. Thus, for at least this reason and the reasons set forth in the

Appl. No. 10/720,512
Response to OA and RCE
Reply to OA of January 13, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 1999B060/3

Response to Office Action filed on October 21, 2005, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection and reconsideration of these claims.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, Applicants believe the currently pending claims, as amended, are allowable. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested, and a notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Applicants invite the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney if there are any issues outstanding which have not been presented to the Examiner's satisfaction or if the Examiner believes it will assist or expedite his review of the case.

Respectfully submitted,

April 13, 2006

Date



Jeremy P. Welch
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 52,348

ExxonMobil Chemical Company
Law Technology
P.O. Box 2149
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149
Phone: 281-834-2429
Fax: 281-834-2495